UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,314	10/28/2003	Karl J. Guegler	PF-0025-4 DIV	5007

22428 7590 05/10/2005

FOLEY AND LARDNER
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER	
MERTZ, PREMA MARIA	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1646	

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/700,314	GUEGLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Prema M. Mertz	1646	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-62 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) 1-62 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction.

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

Group 1. Claims 1-2, 17-18, 56-62, drawn to a chemokine polypeptide of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:2, classified in class 530, subclass 351.

Group 2. Claims 3-7, 9-10 and 12-13, 46, 48-55, drawn to a DNA molecule encoding a chemokine polypeptide of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:2, an expression vector, a host cell and a method for producing the polypeptide, classified in class 435, subclass 69.5.

Group 3. Claim 8, drawn to a transgenic organism comprising a DNA molecule encoding a chemokine polypeptide of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:2, classified in class 800, subclass 13.

Group 4. Claims 11, 31-32, 34, 36-43, drawn to an antibody to a chemokine polypeptide of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:2, classified in class 530, subclass 387.9.

Group 5. Claims 14-15, drawn to a diagnostic test using a DNA molecule encoding a chemokine polypeptide of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:2, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

Group 6. Claim 16, drawn to a diagnostic test using a DNA molecule encoding a chemokine polypeptide of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:2, by amplifying a target molecule using PCR, classified in class 435, subclass 91.2.

Group 7. Claim 19, drawn to a method for treating a disease or condition by administering a chemokine polypeptide of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:2, classified in class 424, subclass 85.1.

Group 8. Claim 20, drawn to a method of screening for an agonist of the polypeptide of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:2, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.

Group 9. Claim 21, drawn to an agonist of the polypeptide of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:2, class and subclass undeterminable.

Group 10. Claim 22, drawn to a method for treating a disease by administering an agonist of the chemokine polypeptide of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:2, class and subclass undeterminable.

Group 11. Claim 23, drawn to a method of screening for an antagonist of the polypeptide of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:2, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.

Group 12. Claim 24, drawn to an antagonist of the polypeptide of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:2, class and subclass undeterminable.

Group 13. Claim 25, drawn to a method for treating a disease by administering an antagonist of the chemokine polypeptide of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:2, class and subclass undeterminable.

Group 14. Claim 26, drawn to a method of screening for a compound that binds to the polypeptide of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:2, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.

Group 15. Claim 27, drawn to a method of screening for a compound that modulates the activity of the polypeptide of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:2, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.

Group 16. Claim 28, drawn to a method of screening for a compound that alters expression of a target polynucleotide encoding a polypeptide of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:2, classified in class 435, subclass 4.

Group 17. Claim 29, drawn to a method of assessing toxicity of a test compound on a polypeptide of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:2, classified in class 435, subclass 4.

Group 18. Claims 30, 44, drawn to a diagnostic method using an antibody to a polypeptide of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:2, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.

Group 19. Claim 33, 35, drawn to a method for treating a disease or condition by administering an antibody to a chemokine polypeptide of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:2, classified in class 424, subclass 131.1.

Group 20. Claim 45, drawn to a method of purifying a polypeptide of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:2 using the antibody, classified in class 530, subclass 413.

Group 21. Claim 47, drawn to a method of generating an expression profile using polynucleotides encoding the polypeptide of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:2, classified in class 436, subclass 6.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions 1-4, 9, 12, are independent and distinct, each from the other, because they are products which possess characteristic differences in structure and function and each has an independent utility, that is distinct for each invention which cannot be exchanged. The DNA of invention 2 can be used to make a hybridization probe or can be used in gene therapy as well as in the production of the protein of interest. The protein of invention 1 can be used as a probe, or used therapeutically or diagnostically (e.g. in screening). The antibody of invention 4 can be used to obtain the polynucleotide of Group 2, and can also be used in diagnostics, e.g. as a probe in immunoassays. The transgenic organism of Group 3 can be used to obtain overexpression of the trans-gene in the organism or as disease model..

Inventions 2 and 1 are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP 806.05(f)). In the instant case, other than by using the DNA, the polypeptides can be prepared by materially different processes, such as by chemical synthesis, or obtained from nature using various isolation and purification protocols.

Inventions 2 and 5-6, 16, 21are related as product and processes of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP 806.05(h)). In the instant case the products as claimed can be used in the process of producing a recombinant protein.

Inventions 1 and 7, 8, 11, 14, 15, 17, are related as product and processes of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used as antigen in the production of antibodies.

Inventions 4 and 18-20, are related as product and processes of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in situ immunochemistry.

Inventions 9, 12 and 10, 13, are related as products and processes of use, respectively. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP 806.05(h)). In the instant case the products as claimed can be used as antigen in the production of antibodies.

Inventions 1 and 5-6, 10, 13, 16, 18-21 are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP 806.04, MPEP 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together.

Inventions 2 and7-8, 10-11, 13-14, 15, 17-20, are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP 806.04, MPEP 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together.

Inventions 3 and 5-6, 7-8, 10-11, 13-21, are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP 806.04, MPEP 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together.

Inventions 4 and 5-6, 7-8, 10-11, 13-21, are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP 806.04, MPEP 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together.

Inventions 9, 11 and 5-6, 7-8, 11, 14-21, are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP 806.04, MPEP 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together.

Inventions 5-8, 10-11, 13-21, are independent and distinct, each from the other, because the methods are practiced with different starting materials, materially different process steps for materially different purposes and each method requires a non-coextensive search because of different starting materials, process steps and goals.

Having shown that these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and recognized divergent subject matter as defined by MPEP 808.02, the Examiner has *prima facie* shown a serious burden of search (see MPEP 803). Therefore, an initial requirement of restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

2. Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 C.F.R 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(h).

3. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Advisory Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prema Mertz whose telephone number is (571) 272-0876. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00AM to 3:30PM (Eastern time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Caputa, can be reached on (571) 272-0829.

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to (571) 273-8300. Faxed draft or informal communications with the examiner should be directed to (571) 273-0876.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Prema Mertz

Prema Mertz Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1646
May 3, 2005